

unless the families pay for care. This was not just dreamed up. If you read the Washington Post and other major newspapers, that came out yesterday, and that is what the story says. Families are going to have to start paying.

Mr. President, I have a lot more to say. I am only going to say that we have a lot of problems with the deficit that comes every year. We have a bigger problem with the debt that is accumulating. That was not done with the Democratic administrations. We have \$5 trillion in debt. I hope that we will not only talk about balancing the budget on a yearly basis but we talk about doing something with the underlying debt. I hope that is something that is addressed in the immediate future. Not only should we be concerned about the annual deficits, but the underlying \$5 trillion in debt is something we must address.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### 1995 YEAR END REPORT

The mailing and filing date of the 1995 year end report required by the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, is Wednesday, January 31, 1996. Principal campaign committees supporting Senate candidates file their reports with the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Public Records office will be open from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. In general, reports will be available the day after receipt. For further information, please contact the Public Records Office on (202) 224-0322.

#### REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 1995 fourth quarter mass mailings is January 25, 1996. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Public Records office will be open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records Office on (202) 224-0322.

#### TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. MACK. I rise today to extend my heartfelt condolences to the family of

Rev. Richard Halverson. In his position as the U.S. Senate Chaplain for the past 14 years, Reverend Halverson acted as spiritual leader to me personally, as well as to the entire Senate. His unwavering devotion, knowledge, and guidance have been a powerful example of living by one's convictions. It is an example from which we should derive inspiration as we search for the true meaning in our lives. I will keep the family of Reverend Halverson in my thoughts and prayers during their time of grief.

#### THE IMMIGRATION REFORM DEBATE

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to set forth my general concerns about S. 1394, a bill passed out of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration a few weeks ago. In general, this bill would combine measures aimed at reducing illegal immigration with dramatic reductions in legal immigration. In my view, illegal and legal immigration are very different issues. Illegal immigration is a significant national problem, one that we should address by discussing ways to deal with people who cross our borders unlawfully. In contrast, legal immigrants are overwhelmingly law-abiding and hardworking people who contribute to our economy and our society. We should deal with the real problem of illegal immigration without retreating from America's historic commitment to legal immigration.

Mr. President, I would like to make an obvious point: America is a land of immigrants. For most of our history we have welcomed anyone with the desire and fortitude necessary to come here in search of a better life.

Lady Liberty has held our door open to the teeming masses of the world, not out of pity, but out of respect for our Nation's immigrant roots, and in the knowledge that immigrants made this country strong and prosperous, and will continue to do so, so long as we let them.

We as a people will remain a vibrant, shining example to the world, so long as we continue to look out to that world, welcoming those who would join us in building a free and open society.

We have every right and even responsibility to expect those who come to our land to live up to our standards of decency and responsibility. We can and should expect able-bodied immigrants to work. We can and should expect them to forego the often debilitating effects of welfare.

But we should not slam the door shut to people yearning to be free, and to build a better life for themselves and their families.

My grandparents were all immigrants. They came to this country from Lebanon about a century ago in search of freedom. None of the four could speak English. And they had few material resources to speak of. But they came to America because they

wanted to live in a country that was free and they wanted their children and their grandchildren to live in a nation that was free. My grandparents did not come here pursuing government benefits. They believed in their own capacity to do things, and they wanted a place where they would have a chance to enjoy the freedom to do the things they wanted.

My parents did better in America than their parents. My parents were very hard-working folks. Neither of them had a college education. My dad worked almost 20 years as a UAW member on an assembly line in an Oldsmobile factory in Lansing, MI. After that, he and my mom started a small business. They worked hard; 6 sometimes 7 days a week in order to give me and my sisters a chance to share in the American Dream—to have more freedom and opportunity than they did. Their hard work has allowed me to succeed in turn; I was the first child in our family to go to college.

Unfortunately, I believe that this bill will make it more difficult for people like my grandparents to come to America.

Specifically, S. 1394 would significantly reduce the quotas for legal immigration, restrict immigration as a means to re-unite separated families, and eliminate whole categories of legal immigration.

I believe these measures will cause real harm to our economy and to our Nation as a whole. Most damaging, they will keep us from benefiting from the hard work, experience and expertise of legal immigrants.

Immigrants are the ultimate entrepreneurs. They are people willing to risk it all in a new and different land. They are self-selected and seek to make a better life for themselves and their families.

As economist Thomas Sowell writes in his *Ethnic America: A History*:

The fact that immigrants not only equal, but eventually surpass, their native-born counterparts suggests that they brought some advantage in terms of human capital, that migration is a selective process, bringing the more ambitious or venturesome or able elements of a population.

Mr. President, these are the kind of people we want to become Americans. These are the kind of people who sacrifice so their children can rise to the top of their class.

Immigrants also create a brain gain for the United States. One in three people who have graduated from college in engineering in this country is an immigrant, according to the National Research Center.

Immigrant expertise is widespread and impressive. In the 20th century between 20 and 50 percent of all Nobel Prize winners, depending on the discipline involved, have been immigrants to the United States. As of 1988 there were more Russian Nobel Prize winners living in the United States than living in Russia.

These highly educated, highly skilled immigrants are essential to the competitiveness of America's high-technology industries. Consider Intel, one of the most prolific and expanding companies in the United States, employing tens of thousands of American workers.

Intel constantly develops cutting edge technologies that will define the computer industry in the 21st century. And it is doing all of this with a great deal of help from America's newest immigrants.

At one point not long ago three members of Intel's top management, including chief executive officer Andrew S. Grove, from Hungary, were immigrants.

Intel and other high-technology firms must seek out and hire immigrants because the demand for highly skilled workers exceeds the supply. After recruiting on American campuses, these companies still do not have enough highly skilled engineers, scientists, and computer specialists they need to remain competitive. Only because their need is real do companies go through the trouble, expense and government paperwork necessary to hire foreign workers.

But productive immigrants are not just computer programmers in Silicon Valley. Arab-Americans in Dearborn and Detroit, Vietnamese in Arlington, Cubans in Miami, and a number of other immigrant groups in a number of cities have revitalized America's urban areas.

Whether it is the Korean grocer or the Chinese restaurateur, our urban areas in particular owe a great deal to entrepreneurial, hard-working immigrants willing to take chances, to start small businesses in areas others have ignored.

Mr. President, immigration is not a zero-sum game in which every job that goes to a foreign-born worker means one less job for an American worker. Immigration is a positive-sum gain for Americans in terms of jobs, living standards, and economic growth. When a business adds a new resource—whether it is a labor or capital resource—it generates more jobs, more income, and more opportunities for Americans, not less. This is especially true when the resource is a talented, creative, and inventive worker. As George Gilder points out, the beneficial impact of immigrants on the U.S. economy “is overwhelming and undeniable: it is all around us, in a spate of inventions and technical advances, from microwaves and air bags to digital cable and satellite television, from home computers and air conditioners to cellular phones and lifesaving pharmaceutical and medical devices.” Mr. Gilder estimates that without immigration over the last 50 years, U.S. real living standards would be at least 40 percent lower. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by George Gilder on the economic benefits of immigration in yesterday's Wall Street Journal be

placed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, lowering the legal immigrant quota will lower the benefit we can gain from hard-working and highly-skilled immigrants. Tightening restrictions on family unification also will cost us a great deal. It will cost us our principles because we know well that U.S. citizens should be able to bring their elderly parents to this country after he has established himself here. And we know well that others, adult sisters and brothers and other relatives, particularly those living under the many repressive regimes in this world, should be allowed to join their relatives in the land of freedom.

And keeping families separated also will be bad for our economy. Skilled workers will be less likely to come to America if they know that they will not be allowed to reunite their families. Most people are reluctant to move out of town if they cannot see their families. In my view, America will not be able to attract the “best and the brightest” from around the world if we impose barriers that prevent people from re-uniting with their parents and siblings.

Mr. President, in my view S. 1394's provisions restricting legal immigration are misconceived; they are misconceived because they are based on misconceptions: first, that immigrants take jobs away from Americans who need them, second, that immigrants are a drain on our governments and third, that immigrants are a danger to our culture.

Contrary to popular myth, immigrants do not increase the rate of unemployment among American workers.

There is a great deal of empirical evidence to support this position.

First, the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution studied immigration patterns over the long term in America. They found that, historically, periods of heavy immigration have not been associated with subsequent higher than normal unemployment.

Second, the Manhattan Institute compared the ten states with the highest immigrant presence with the ten states with the lowest immigrant presence and found that the high-immigrant states actually had lower unemployment rates, in the aggregate, than did the low-immigrant states.

The median unemployment rate in States with large immigrant populations was 5.1 percent while that for the 10 States with low immigrant populations was 6.6 percent—a full 1.5 percent difference.

I could go on, Mr. President, but there is no need. Let me instead quote Julian Simon. This University of Maryland professor and author of the seminal work on “The Economic Consequences of Immigration” recently finished an immigration report for the

Cato Institute. In that report he states unequivocally: “The studies uniformly show that immigrants do not increase the rate of native unemployment.”

It's as simple as that. Immigrants do not increase unemployment. In fact, Mr. President, immigrants do not take jobs, they create jobs. By advancing our technology, by developing better products, by starting new businesses and by themselves consuming goods, immigrants expand and create whole new areas of production employing thousands of native-born Americans.

This brings us to the second mistaken assumption underlying attempts to restrict immigration: that legal immigrants are a drain on the public coffers.

Mr. President, when total government expenditures per capita are considered, the government spends about one third less per immigrant than it does per native. This is because immigrants are more likely than natives to be of working age. They pay into the tax system without taking out, for example, Social Security payments. Further, refugees fleeing persecution automatically qualify for government benefits when they are admitted into the United States. If we factor out the use of welfare among refugees, immigrants or working age are less likely to use welfare than are the native born.

As Julian Simon of the University of Maryland reported recently in the Wall Street Journal, “the immigrant family contributes yearly about \$2,500 more in taxes to public coffers than it obtains in services.” And those who still fear the costs of immigration should remember a policy option which we already have substantially put in place: “immigration yes, welfare no.”

Current law already forbids almost all immigrants from receiving welfare for their first three years in this country. We can legitimately toughen these standards. And our welfare reform bill does so by denying noncash benefits such as supplemental security income and food stamps to immigrants.

But we should recognize that the vast majority of immigrants are working hard, in real jobs that add to the well-being of our people and our country.

There is one final misconception underlying S. 1394's provisions restricting immigration. It has been said that America needs a reduction in immigration for the sake of our culture.

Some Americans have expressed concern about a new wave of immigrants, bringing new customs and ways of life to our shores.

Despite the scare tactics we sometimes hear, however, immigrants are not breaking down our culture. First, Mr. President, immigrants are not coming to America in unprecedented numbers. Professor Simon's cautious estimate, based on census data, is that as of 1990, immigrants made up only 8.5 percent of our population. That compares with averages over 13 percent between 1860 and 1920. As a proportion of

the total population, then, immigrant numbers have dropped by more than a third.

What is more, the Manhattan Institute's "Index of Leading Immigration Indicators" shows that, compared with the native born, immigrants are more likely to have intact families, more likely to have college degrees, more likely to be working, and no more likely to commit crimes than native born Americans.

We are not being swamped by unmanageable numbers of immigrants. Further, Mr. President, immigrants are like the rest of us in all the ways that matter. They are hard-working, family-oriented people who come here to make a better life for themselves and their children. They are, in fact, the kind of people each and every one of us would and should be happy and proud to have as neighbors.

It seems clear to me, Mr. President, that legal immigration is a boon to our Nation's economy and society. Unfortunately, S. 1394 tends to obscure the benefits of legal immigration because it contains provisions addressing illegal immigration as well. Indeed, much of the driving force behind S. 1394 is directed, not at those who legally come to this country, but at those who come here illegally. We can address the illegal immigration problem through better border policing and better and swifter methods of deportation, particularly in regard to criminal illegal aliens. And as I mentioned earlier, we have addressed the welfare magnet problem in our welfare reform bill.

That's why I think we should split S. 1394 and move on illegal immigration reform separately from legal immigration reform.

But even some of the illegal immigration components of S. 1394 go much farther than is necessary. Illegal immigrants now constitute 1.5 percent of our population. That is too high a percentage, but we need to examine more effective—and less intrusive ways—to control illegal immigration.

This legislation proposes to end illegal immigration by requiring a national Identification system for all employees. In order to get a new job, every American will have to prove his or her citizenship by showing that he or she is listed on a specific, national computer registry.

Before an employer can hire a new worker that employer will have to contact the Federal Government for verification of the would-be employee's citizenship. Thus we will construct a vast new Government bureaucracy, with vast new powers and, Mr. President, with cast new costs.

Current estimates suggest that, with a national I.D. system, each work place would have to spend nearly \$800 for equipment alone. And the Immigration and Naturalization Service Telephone Verification Pilot System, often seen as a prototype for the new I.D. System, shows that operating costs could put many companies out of business. It is

for this reason that the Nation Federation of Independent Businesses—America's leading small business organization—strongly opposes the I.D. system in S. 1394.

It is clear that the system itself will not work. It will be riddled with errors. Indeed, current Social Security Administration files and error rates show a probable error rate of between 25 and 28 percent for the new system, making it far from effective. Even assuming an error rate of only 3 percent, the system would put in bureaucratic limbo or even deny jobs to 2 million Americans, most of them native-born U.S. citizens.

Advocates of the proposed I.D. system in S. 1394 claim that it is only a "pilot project" that would cover workers in just five States. However, these States—Texas, Florida, Illinois, New York and California—have a population greater than that of Mexico, indeed of all but the 10 largest countries in the world. According to Stuart Anderson of the Cato Institute, employers in these States would have to check the legal status of each new hire—an estimated 22 million annually in these five States—through this government I.D. system.

In my judgment, we should reject the national I.D. Cards and other similar schemes designed to control illegal immigration because they will result in more government intrusion in the affairs of U.S. citizens and businesses.

I am also troubled by other aspects of this bill that I will comment upon in more detail in the near future. For example, I am very concerned about the proposed border tax, which would in effect discourage foreign tourists from spending their money in this country.

The debate over immigration reform will be a major issue in this chamber over the next year. I hope that we in this body will, first, reject some of the severe provisions of S. 1394 and second, move separately on bills dealing with legal and illegal immigration. This would constitute a statement of confidence in ourselves, in our nation and in the ability of immigrants, when extended the opportunities of our land to become productive members of our communities.

In closing Mr. President, I believe that our immigration policy both reflects and projects our Nation's character and level of decency. One man above all said it best. In his farewell address to the Nation, President Ronald Reagan declared:

I've spoken of the shining city all my political life, but I don't know if I ever quite communicated what I saw when I said it. But in my mind it was a tall, proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, windswept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace, a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity. And if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will and heart to get here. That's how I saw it and see it still.

The question for America is this: Shall we have a shining city on a hill or will we construct a fortress Amer-

ica? It is my hope that we will choose the shining city.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 18, 1995]

#### GENIUSES FROM ABROAD

(By George Gilder)

The current immigration debate founders on ignorance of one huge fact: Without immigration, the U.S. would not exist as a world power. Without immigration, the U.S. could not have produced the computerized weapons that induced the Soviet Union to surrender in the arms race. Without immigration, the U.S. could not have built the atomic bomb during World War II, or the hydrogen bomb in the early 1950s, or intercontinental missiles in the 1960s, or MIRVs in the 1970s, or cruise missiles for the Gulf War in the 1990s.

Today, immigrants are vital not only for targeted military projects but also for the wide range of leading-edge ventures in an information age economy. No less than military superiority in previous eras, U.S. industrial dominance and high standards of living today depend on outsiders.

Every high-technology company, big or small, is like a Manhattan Project. All must mobilize the personnel best trained and most able to perform a specific function, and deliver a product within a window of opportunity as fateful and remorseless as a war deadline. This requires access to the small elite of human beings in the world capable of pioneering these new scientific and engineering frontiers. For many specialized high-technology tasks, the pool of potential talent around the world numbers around 10 people, or even fewer.

#### THE RIGHT PEOPLE

If you are running such a technology company, you will quickly discover that the majority of this cognitive elite are not citizens of your country. Unless you can find the right people wherever they may be, you will not be able to launch the exotic innovation that changes the world. Unless you can fill the key technology jobs, you will not create any other jobs at all, and your country will forgo the cycle of new products, skills, and businesses that sustain a world-leading standard of living.

Discussing the impact of immigration, economists and their followers are beady-eyed gnatcatchers, expert on the movements of cabbage pickers and au pair girls and the possible impact of Cubans on Miami wage levels. But like hunters in a cartoon, they ignore the tyrannosaurus rex crouching behind them. Thus sophisticated analysts, such as George Borjas of the University of California, San Diego, and artful writers, such as Peter Brimelow, conclude that the impact of immigration on the U.S. economy is slight or negligible.

In fact, the evidence is overwhelming and undeniable; it is all around us, in a spate of inventions and technical advances, from microwaves and air bags to digital cable and satellite television, from home computers and air conditioners to cellular phones and lifesaving pharmaceuticals and medical devices. Without immigration over the last 50 years, I would estimate that U.S. real living standards would be at least 40% lower.

The underplaying of immigration as an economic force stems from a basic flaw in macroeconomic analysis. Economists fail to account for the indispensable qualitative effects of genius. Almost by definition, genius is the ability to generate unique products

and concepts and bring them to fruition. Geniuses are literally thousands of times more productive than the rest of us. We all depend on them for our livelihoods and opportunities.

The feats of genius are necessarily difficult to identify or predict, except in retrospect. But judging from the very rough metric of awards of mathematical doctorates and other rigorous scientific and engineering degrees, prizes, patents, and publications, about a third of the geniuses in the U.S. are foreign born, and another 20% are the offspring of immigrants. A third of all American Nobel Prize winners, for example, were born overseas.

A stellar example of these elites in action is Silicon Valley in California. Silicon Valley companies have reduced the price of computer MIPs and memory bits by a factor of some 10,000 in 2½ decades. Although mainstream economists neglect to measure the qualitative impact of these innovations, most of the new value in the world economy over the last decade has stemmed, directly or indirectly, from the semiconductor and computer industries, both hardware and software.

Consider Intel Corp. Together with its parent, Fairchild Semiconductor, Intel developed the basic processes of microchip manufacture and created dynamic and static random access memory, the microprocessor, and the electrically programmable read-only memory. In other words, Intel laid the foundations for the personal computer revolution and scores of other chip-based industries that employ the vast bulk of U.S. engineers today.

Two American-born geniuses, Robert Noyce and Gordon Moore, were key founders of Fairchild and Intel. But their achievements would have been impossible without the help of Jean Hourni, inventor of planar processing; Dov Frohmann-Benkowski, inventor of electrically erasable programmable ROMs; Federico Faggin, inventor of silicon gate technology and builder of the first microprocessor; Mayatoshi Shima, layout designer of key 8086 family devices; and of course Andrew Grove, the company's now revered CEO who solved several intractable problems of the metal oxide silicon technology at the heart of Intel's growth. All these Intel engineers—and hundreds of other key contributors—were immigrants.

The pattern at Intel was repeated throughout Silicon Valley, from National Semiconductor and Advanced Micro Devices to Applied Materials, LSI Logic, Actel, Atmel, Integrated Device Technologies, Xicor, Cypress, Sun Microsystems and Hewlett-Packard, all of which from the outset heavily depended on immigrants in the laboratories and on engineering workbenches. LSI, IDT, Actel, Atmel, Xicor, and Sun were all founded or led by immigrants. Today, fully one-third of all the engineers in Silicon Valley are foreign born.

Now, with Silicon Valleys proliferating throughout the U.S. economy, with Silicon Deserts, Prairies, Mountains, and even Alleys being hopefully launched from Manhattan to Oregon, immigration becomes ever more vital to the future of the U.S. economy. And microchips are just the beginning. On the foundation of silicon have arisen world-leading software and medical equipment industries almost equally dependent on immigrants. As spearhead of the fastest growing U.S. industry, software, Microsoft offers some of the most coveted jobs in the U.S. economy. But for vital functions, it still must turn to immigrants for 5% of its domestic work force, despite the difficult and expensive legal procedures required to import an alien.

#### FREEDOM OF ENTERPRISE

In recent congressional testimony, Ira Rubenstein, a Microsoft attorney, declared that immigration bars could jeopardize the 58 percent of its revenue generated overseas, threaten American dominance of advanced "client-server" business applications, and render "stillborn" the information superhighway. In particular, Corning and other producers of fiber-optic technology have faced a severe shortage of native engineers equipped to pursue this specialty crucial to both telecommunications and medical instruments.

With U.S. high school students increasingly shunning mathematics and the hard sciences, America is the global technology and economic leader in spite of, not because of, any properties of the American gene pool or dominant culture. America prevails only because it offers the freedom of enterprise and innovation to people from around the world.

A decision to cut back legal immigration today, as Congress is contemplating, is a decision to wreck the key element of the American technological miracle. After botching the issues of telecom deregulation and tax rate reduction, and wasting a year on Hooverian myths about the magic of a balanced budget, the Republican Congress now proposes to issue a deadly body blow to the intellectual heart of U.S. growth. Congress must not cripple the new Manhattan Projects of the U.S. economy in order to pursue some xenophobic and archaic dream of ethnic purity and autarky.

#### THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal Government is running on borrowed time, not to mention borrowed money—nearly \$5 trillion of it. As of the close of business Monday, December 18, the Federal debt stood at \$4,989,213,998,043.63. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,939.14 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

More than two centuries ago, the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence. It's time for Congress to adopt a Declaration of Economic Responsibilities and an amendment requiring the President and Congress to come up with a balanced Federal budget—beginning right now.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 418. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Carron, Jr.

H.R. 419. An act for the relief of Benchmark Rail Group, Inc.

H.R. 1315. An act for the relief of Kris Murty.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 660. An act to amend the Fair Housing Act to modify the exemption from certain familial status discrimination prohibitions granted to housing for older persons.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 3:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2203. An act to reauthorize the tied aid credit program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and to allow the Export-Import Bank to conduct a demonstration project.

H.R. 2627. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the founding of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.R. 2808. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Facilitation Act of 1994 until March 31, 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal.

At 8:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1398. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 1203 Lemay Ferry Road, St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building."

H.R. 1880. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, Illinois, as the "Edward Madigan Post Office Building."

H.R. 2029. An act to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to provide regulatory relief, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2262. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 218 North Alston Street, in Foley, Alabama, as the "Holk Post Office Building."

H.R. 2704. An act to provide that the United States Post Office building that is to be located on the 7436 South Exchange Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building."

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol